REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of August 21, 2006 is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner maintained the prior art rejections initially set forth in the previous Office Action of April 20, 2006. In particular, the Examiner rejected independent claim 1, independent claims 5-9, and dependent claims 2 and 10 as being unpatentable over the Kirkhart reference (US 6,059,843) in view of the Amano reference (US 6,806,588); rejected claims 3 and 11 as being unpatentable over the Kirkhart reference in view of the Amano reference, and further in view of the Gillespie reference (US 6,393,573); and rejected claims 4 and 12 as being unpatentable over the Kirkhart reference in view of the Amano reference, and further in view of the Hirano reference (US 4,688,036). However, the claims have now been amended as indicated above. Therefore, for the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Quite often, a vehicle operator parks and exits the vehicle, and then becomes unsure whether the vehicle was properly locked after exiting. The vehicle operator will then use a keyless entry system as a check to ensure that the vehicle is properly locked by quickly unlocking and locking the doors. Unfortunately, unlocking the door might unnecessarily cause the vehicle's computer to be booted up merely because the vehicle operator intended to verify that the door was locked, thereby draining the computer power source.

The invention as recited in the amended claims avoids this unnecessary booting up of the vehicle computer. In particular, amended independent claims 1, 6, 7, and 9 all now recite:

(1) a time measuring section for measuring *an amount of time from when the unlocking/locking detecting section detects that the door is unlocked*; and

(2) an auxiliary battery control section for booting up a computer by starting the power supply from an auxiliary battery to the computer *if the unlocking/locking detecting section does not detect that the door of the vehicle is locked after the time measuring section has measured a predetermined amount of time.*

As generally explained in paragraphs [0072] through [0074] of the specification, the invention as now recited in amended independent claims 1, 6, 7, and 9 causes the booting up of the vehicle computer to be slightly delayed for the predetermined amount of time after the unlocking/locking detecting section detects that the door is unlocked. Consequently, if the door is unlocked and then quickly re-locked so as to verify the status of the door as discussed above, the computer will not be booted up. In other words, as recited in the amended independent claims, the auxiliary battery control section starts the power supply *if* the door is not detected as being locked after the predetermined period of time. Consequently, the power source for the computer will not be unnecessarily drained simply because the vehicle operator frequently verifies that the vehicle is locked (see paragraph [0076] of the specification).

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the Kirkhart reference teaches a time measuring section for measuring an amount of time from when the unlocking/locking detection section detects that the door is unlocked, and referred to column 5, lines 52-57 of the Kirkhart reference. However, the cited section of the Kirkhart reference merely explains that the electrical system of the Kirkhart reference includes detection circuitry 50 for *determining that the* ***engine is not running*** *within a predetermined time period of detecting the* ***presence of the driver***. The Kirkhart reference does not, however, disclose or suggest a time measuring section for measuring an amount of time from when an unlocking/locking detecting section detects that the door is unlocked, as recited in the amended independent claims. In fact, the detection circuitry 50 is not even in any sort of relationship with a component that is capable of detecting whether a door of vehicle is locked or unlocked.

In discussing original claim 5 on page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner also asserted that the Kirkhart reference teaches a power source switching section for stopping a power supply from the battery to the computer and starting a power supply from the main power source to the computer "when the ignition key detecting section detects that the ignition key is switched from OFF to ON during the power supply from the battery." However, it appears that the Examiner mistakenly referred to the wrong claim language. In particular, original claim 5, and newly-amended independent claims 1, 6, 7, and 9, all recite that the auxiliary battery control section is

operable to boot up the computer by starting the power supply from the auxiliary battery to the computer *if the unlocking/locking detection section does not detect that the door of the vehicle is locked after the time measuring section has measured a predetermined amount of time.* The Kirkhart reference does not teach or even suggest such a feature.

As explained above, the Kirkhart reference does not teach or even suggest a time measuring section for measuring an amount of time from when the unlocking/locking detection section detects that the door is unlocked, or a relationship between the auxiliary battery control section, the unlocking/locking detecting section, and the time measuring section as recited in amended independent claims 1, 6, 7, and 9. Furthermore, the Amano reference, the Gillespie reference, and the Hirano reference also do not disclose or suggest these features. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated by the Amano reference, the Gillespie reference, or the Hirano reference to modify the Kirkhart reference so as to obtain the invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 6, 7, and 9. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 6, 7, and 9, and the claims that depend therefrom, are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Tsuyoshi KINDO et al.

By: _____

W. Douglas Hahm
Registration No. 44,142
Attorney for Applicants

WDH/ck
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 16, 2006